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35
An unfinished zoomorphic escutcheon of possible 5th-century date from Twyning near Tewkesbury

In 2006 a cast copper-alloy zoomorphic escutcheon was found near Twyning, just north of Tewkesbury, and recorded by Ms Angie Bolton on the Portable Antiquities Scheme (WAW-CE0AC5) (Figs 1 and 2). It was correctly identified as an escutcheon from a hanging bowl and parallels were made to the well-known late Roman zoomorphic belt-fittings¹ and the hanging bowl from the 6th-century Anglo-Saxon grave at Sleaford (Lincs.).² The object was described, photographed and drawn and dated tentatively to the Roman period. It was then returned to the finder, who kindly made the object available to the author for study in 2015.

The escutcheon is kite- or heater-shaped (of pointed oval form, although the point on this example is flattened) and slightly rounded in cross section. The interior of the escutcheon is concave and clearly intended to fit the curvature of the vessel. The hook has flattened sides and terminates in a zoomorphic animal of indeterminate species. Four evenly-spaced balls form a ‘mane’, and further down, in the middle of the escutcheon, is another ball.

The escutcheon and hook are extremely well paralleled by the two hanging bowls from Finningley (Notts.).³ The escutcheons on both vessels are kite-shaped with zoomorphic animals decorated with a ‘mane’ of four balls and a central ball in the middle of the escutcheon.⁴ This arrangement is very close to that displayed by the Twyning object.

The Twyning escutcheon is remarkable, however, for being unfinished. A casting seam is visible along the interior of the object and a similar (but less prominent) seam is visible on the exterior. Even more telling is the fact that the hook is filled, and thus the object can never have been used. This unfinished object may have been rejected by the metalworker because of its flattened point. The metal was shown to be a copper-lead-tin alloy by Portable X-Ray Florescence analysis carried out on the uncleaned object at Newcastle University in 2015.

Establishing the date of hanging bowls has long been recognised as a complex and problematic subject.⁵ A number of vessels, like those from Finningley,⁶ Newham Bog (Northumb.)⁷ and Drapers’ Gardens (London),⁸ display distinct affinities with a poorly-dated late Roman copper-alloy vessel

3. Ibid. nos 109 and 111.
4. Ibid. figs 438 and 445.
5. e.g. T. Kendrick, ‘British hanging-bowls’, Antiquity 6 (1932), 161–84; H. Geake, ‘When were hanging bowls deposited in Anglo-Saxon graves?’, Medieval Archaeol. 43 (1999), 1–18; Bruce-Mitford and Raven, Corpus.
7. Ibid. no. 71.
Fig. 1  Drawing of the Twyning escutcheon (PAS WAW-CE0AC5) (© Candy Stevens and the Portable Antiquities Scheme). The object is 53.9 mm long and 21.7 mm wide.

Fig. 2  Photograph of the Twyning escutcheon (© Portable Antiquities Scheme).
form known as the Irchester bowl. Of these hanging bowls, only the one from Drapers’ Gardens was recovered during an archaeological excavation. This vessel was deposited no earlier than AD 378 and it may quite possibly have been lost in the early 5th century. Two other typologically early hanging bowls, from Sleaford and Chessel Down (Isle of Wight), were recovered from 6th-century or later Anglo-Saxon graves. Bruce-Mitford and Raven would, however, date the Finningley, Newham Bog, Sleaford and Chessel Down vessels on stylistic grounds to the 5th century.

The escutcheon from Twyning is possible evidence of 5th-century bronze vessel production. As such, it is an important indicator of post-Roman activity in Gloucestershire. We might go further and note that metalworking seems to have been closely associated with elite settlements. Therefore, the escutcheon may indicate the location of a 5th-century power centre. Given that Twyning was the site of a monastery by the 8th century, the possibility of an early medieval locus in the vicinity would appear strong.

As an addition to the growing corpus of hanging bowls and their escutcheons, the Twyning object provides a fascinating insight into where some early examples may have been made. It also sheds a little more light on the enigmatic finds from Finningley.

JAMES GERRARD
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Doverow Hill, Stonehouse:
a natural springhead super-mound?

Doverow Hill, commonly known as Doverow, stands out from the Cotswold scarp to overlook the Severn vale to the west of Stroud. The hill was studied in 2010 as a contribution to ‘Landscapes of Governance’, a project by the Institute of Archaeology at University College London. This work suggested that Doverow might have provided the site of the open-air meeting-place of Blacklow hundred, which existed at the time of Domesday Book in 1086, but was later incorporated into Whitstone hundred. The second element of Blacklow is Old English *hlāw*, an Anglo-Saxon term for a significant hill or burial mound; but in the case of Doverow there is little indication of what this significance might have been. No clear evidence has been found on it of burials or fortifications, and it could only be supposed to have been seen as resembling a burial mound, topped by dark (OE *blæc*) woods, or by a pale (OE *blāc*) limestone quarry. However, the presidential address...
given to BGAS by Professor Timothy Darvill in 2014 has given rise to a conjecture that the hill might have been regarded as a natural 'springhead super-mound'.

Geologically, Doverow Hill is a block slipped from the Cotswold scarp in a landslide caused by the saturation of clays during glacial melting. The slippage left a dip in the neck of land linking it to the scarp, making the hill appear somewhat detached. It has the same rock sequence as the main scarp, with spring lines where limestone and other permeable strata are on top of clays, but brought down to lower levels than in the surrounding hills, which perhaps made the springs more evident and accessible. Glacial melting also caused loose material to slump down over the lower slopes, especially south towards the River Frome. Consequently, there are fewer springs at the surface on the southern side of Doverow, but water from the underlying spring lines would have been accessible though seepage into natural ponds, augmented from early times by dug wells.

Doverow is the source of the Caudle stream, which rises from the Caudle and Verney springs on its western slopes. In 1849 the combined Caudle springs were supplying 393 gallons an hour, and the Verney spring 98 gallons an hour. This was the surface water supply to what became Stonehouse until the installation of water mains in 1886. The Horsmarling stream, an important local boundary, rises from Doverow's parent scarp and shadows the Caudle stream, and springs on the hill's eastern slopes supply a smaller stream down to Ebley. The pattern of settlement round the hill still follows the lines set by these water sources (Fig. 3).

Doverow relates to the landscape in similar ways to the mounds described by Darvill. It is not at the source of the River Frome, but it does mark the emergence of that river from the Cotswold scarp onto the open Severn vale. It is the source of the Caudle stream and overlooks its confluence with the Frome. This is the site of the manorial centre of Stonehouse, which sits on its own lower spring. It is recorded as Stanbus in 1086, and possibly has Roman or pre-Roman origins. Evidence of Roman or earlier activity has been observed both near this site and near the confluence of the Ebley stream and the River Frome. Doverow is not regularly round in shape, but appears so viewed from the Severn vale, or from the scarp hills to the east and south, all of which are higher. The hill has sight lines to local long barrows and to the hillfort on Haresfield Beacon, and to the north and west to the Malvern hills and the River Severn, which are likely to have been important to early populations (Fig. 4).

If the proposed conjecture were to prove valid, it might solve the mystery of the origin of the name ‘Doverow’, which has long puzzled place-name experts and historians alike. The earliest

19. Gloucestershire Archives [GA], P 316/VE2/1, report on Stonehouse water supplies, 1849; P 316a/PC/10/9, report on emergency water sources in Stonehouse, 1941.
22. Fig. 4 based on Hudson, ‘Blacklow’, 3, and schematic panorama submitted to ‘Landscapes of Governance’ project, 2010.
reference to it given by Smith is dated 1589. However, it is recorded 90 years earlier, in 1499, as ‘in quodam campo voc dev[er]ewsfelde’. There are no known documentary references to it before 1499, although this is probably due to non-survival of records. 23 The name does occur occasionally starting with de-, but the great majority of references start with do-. Most of the early references given by Smith, dated between 1589 and 1642, take the form, in various spellings, of ‘Doverow-s-field’, and refer to the land surrounding the hill, which was the concern of the manorial tenants and the manorial court. ‘Little Doverow-s-field’ lay on the southern slopes of the hill, and ‘Great Doverow-s-field’ covered the neck of land linking it to the scarp. 24 These names join an Old English element, feld, onto the ‘Doverow’ name by using an English possessive -es, meaning ‘the field belonging to Doverow’, a common place-name formation which is not limited to personal names. 25 The top of the hill itself was in the lord’s demesne, not in tenants’ hands and not normally subject to comment by the manorial court. The earliest description found of it as an element of the demesne is dated 1567, when it is the ‘Woodde called Doverie’, and it is called Doverow Wood into more modern times. The same document refers to great and little ‘doveries feylde’. This suggests an early distinction between the hill itself, ‘Doverow’, and the surrounding land, ‘Doverow’s fields’, although this distinction became blurred. A glebe terrier of 1584 refers to

23. GA, D 4289/M1, Stonehouse manor court book, 1589; D 445/M2, Stonehouse manor court rolls, 1499; Smith, Place-Names of Glos. Part 2, 202. The 1589 reference is given by Smith as ‘Dobenesfeilde Yatt’, but the document reads as ‘Doveries’.
24. GA, PC/1850, Jefferys’ map of Stonehouse manor lands, c.1730; Stonehouse tithe map and award, 1839.
‘greate dovery feelde’, while Smith lists an inquisition post mortem of 1632, which describes the demesne wood as ‘Dovereyes’. Sir Robert Atkyns, writing in 1712, says that ‘there is a grove of trees on a hill in this parish, called Deverall’s Wood, which is seen at a great distance’.26

The most tenable suggestions about the meaning of ‘Doverow’ have been either an association with a medieval personal name or a survival of an unknown local British name predating Blacklow hundred, although no direct evidence has been found for either.27 The British place-name elements dubro and dwfr, linked to modern Welsh dwr and dyroedd, and meaning ‘water’, are found in north and south Wales, and are thought to occur in England in the place-names of Dover (Kent), Dovercourt (Essex), Hodder (WR Yorks.), Calder (Cumb.), the River Calder (Lancs.), Dover Beck (Northants.), Wendover (Bucks.), Toller (Dorset), Micheldever (Hants., a form with


Doverhay is thought to derive either from *dubro-ieg* (Old English for ‘island’), or from *doferic*, an alternative form of *dubro*. The element *dubro* is found as a stream name in Gloucestershire, in *Doferburna*, an older name for the Knee brook at Todenham, near Moreton-in-Marsh, and also 7 miles south of Doverow, in the Doverle brook (sometimes mapped as Doverete), a considerable stream flowing west from the scarp on the south side of Stinchcombe hill (Fig. 4). It is common for the ‘b’ in *dubro* to change to a ‘v’. The case for naming a hill after water is speculative, but it would not be unusual for a place-name to refer elliptically to natural features, losing a preposition with time, as in ‘[by] the water’.28 The idea that a natural hill might have been regarded as a springhead super-mound could offer a way of reconciling the modern name with what is potentially a much earlier British one. If Darvill’s dating of springhead mounds applies, the name ‘Doverow’ could have been in use in some form for three millennia before the time of Blacklow and Domesday, a name submerged for a while during the Blacklow era, but never lost from local consciousness.

**JANET HUDSON**
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### The routine bribery of juries in the 14th century

The hundred court was part of the administrative structure of royal jurisdiction, but many had found their way into private hands, and by the 14th century ‘private’ hundreds are frequently found as components of lay estates. The lord’s officials held the courts and the lord took any profits which might accrue. The estate of the lords of Berkeley included the hundreds of Berkeley and Awre in Gloucestershire and the three small Somerset hundreds of Portbury, Bedminster and Harcliffe, which were appurtenances of the manors of Portbury and Bedminster. Bedminster lay on the southern bank of the Avon immediately opposite the town of Bristol. It is now a fully incorporated suburb of the city, and this had its roots as early as the 13th century. In 1281 the important suburb of Redcliffe Street, which provided the Berkeley lord with £16 in rents, was treated as belonging to Gloucestershire because it was part of Bristol.30 The official in charge of the hundred was a bailiff, who presented accounts which were laid out in the usual way, detailing the income received and the way in which this had been used. Four accounts of the bailiff of Bedminster and Harcliffe hundreds survive for the years 1356–60 and the bailiff throughout this period was John Walters acting on behalf of Thomas III Lord Berkeley (d. 1361).31 In individual years the income varied between £18 and £25, but the average was just over £22 a year. The


29. The author would like to acknowledge the valuable assistance provided by David and Marion Grove in the preparation of this paper.


31. Bristol Record Office [BRO], AC/M/1/43.
accounts are illuminating for the way they show how the profits of this private jurisdiction might be employed.

Many of the items of expenditure which Walters claimed are no more than might be expected, for instance the regular expense each year of 3s. 4d. on parchment to make the rolls on which the hundred court proceedings (and extracts from them) were recorded. Various amercements were pardoned to religious institutions; such as 20s. to the Master of St Katherine’s, Bristol; 6s. 8d. to the Master of St John’s, Bristol; 3s. 4d. to the Prior of Bath; and 2s. 8d. to the Abbot of Glastonbury. Subventions were also made to the reeve of Bedminster manor and for other local necessities. All such payments were authorized by tallies or by bills issued by lord’s senior officials such as his steward William de Cheltenham; if the bailiff could not show such an authority, the expenditure was disallowed by the auditors and he bore the cost himself. In the first and last years (1356–7 and 1359–60) the bulk of the remaining funds were despatched to the lord’s receiver, but in the two intervening years most of the funds were expended elsewhere in connection with the lord’s business in three other estate matters.

The most important concerned the lands of John de Gatcombe, who held a messuage and two carucates of land in Long Ashton, Gatcombe and Kencot (valued at £4 a year, but probably worth rather more) and forfeited them as a felon in 1358. In these circumstances, the king took ‘a year, day, and waste’, after which the lands escheated to the lord, the king often selling his rights. In July 1358 Gatcombe granted his lands to William Pykesleigh, rector of Backwell, and John de Bury, chaplain; this may have been an attempt to avoid forfeiture, but it availed him little. On 14 September the escheator, John de Bekynton, took the property into the king’s hands; on 3 October he was instructed to deliver the holding to Nicholas le Carpenter of Cadbury, who had paid £4 to have the king’s ‘year and a day’; and nine days later Nicholas granted the same to Thomas de Berkeley ‘for a certain sum of money’. On 26 October, however, the king ordered Sir Walter le Irish and John de Bridgewater to enquire more fully, as one William de Bourne had claimed that the reversion of the property on its forfeiture belonged to him by virtue of a fine of the 28th year (1354–5), by which he had granted the property to William de Gatcombe and his brother John in successive tail general, presumably with remainder to himself. The resultant inquisition was held at Bristol on 8 January 1359 and found this to be the case, the property having passed from William de Gatcombe, who died without issue, to his brother John and then to John’s son John, who was outlawed for felony.

Such is the bland public record of these events, but the Bedminster hundred accounts illuminate the murky nature of the underlying negotiations and arrangements. Gatcombe himself received payments from the bailiff Walters of 2s. 8d. before 29 September, and another 20s. afterwards. Collusion with Nicholas de Cadbury is also evident, as before 29 September Walters spent 14 days in his company on various journeys to London, and Cadbury was also given 40s. for his expenses for six days during two journeys from Cadbury and from Edington to Berkeley, while after 29 September another 40s. was paid in London for Cadbury’s suit. Two inquisitions are mentioned, the first being at Wells before 29 September, at which 20s. was paid for the expenses of 12 jurors

32. Calendar of Patent Rolls [Cal. Pat.] 1358–61, 98; Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous [Cal. Inq. Misc.], III, 290. According to the calendar of the Patent Roll, the lands had been valued at 40s. a year, but the original record of this specifies a value of 80s. a year, and the inquisition says the lands were worth £4 10s. a year; i.e. 90s.: Berkeley Castle Muniments [BCM] A2/64/5 [SC532]. Long Ashton now lies just outside the boundary of the city of Bristol.
33. BCM, A2/64/4 [GC3474].
and others, 40s. as a gift to the jurors and another 40s. was paid to the escheator Bekynton as a gift, although little reliance appears to have been placed on this as Walters and Nicholas atte Pulle spent a week observing (scrutant) the said escheator while the inquisition was taken. The second was that taken at Bristol before Irish and Bridgewater, and rather more was expended: £1 16s. 1d. on the lord’s behalf by his brother-in-law Sir Edmund de Clevedon, his chief steward William de Cheltenham and others, and no less than £6 12s. as gifts to various jurors. Thus a staggering total of at least £18 10s. 9d. was spent to secure possession of a piece of land alleged to be worth no more than £4. Moreover, the extensive expenditure on the second inquisition was evidently unsuccessful; the jury’s confirmation of the settlement presumably proved that the king’s grant to Cadbury, and thus Cadbury’s grant to Berkeley, was invalid.

Nevertheless, the property was still apparently in Berkeley’s hands during the year 1359–60 and John de Bury’s interest in the lands was causing trouble. Another assize, which concerned the holding and Bury, was held and William Young and the other jurors received 6s. 8d. It is probably not coincidence that Young had in the previous year received a fee of 20s. from the Bedminster hundred profits. In March 1370, by which time John de Gatcombe had recovered possession of his property but was still having trouble with Bury, Gatcombe again granted it to Bury, but in September Bury agreed that if Gatcombe paid him 100s. in the church of Holy Trinity, Bristol, on the following 1 November, the charter of the grant would be void.36 Gatcombe still had possession in November 1376, but by an undated charter he quitclaimed the property to Thomas IV Lord Berkeley.37

Two other affairs were also concerning the lord’s officials at this time. In 1357–8 there was an enquiry in Bristol concerning the ‘woodhire’ or ‘woodshire’ of Bedminster, dues owed in respect of the royal chases which came under the charge of the constables of Bristol castle which had been held by Queen Philippa since 1331.38 This enquiry elicited payments of 20s. to the queen’s steward Henry Kersey, 13s. 4d. to the keeper of her secret seal Richard Killesby, 6s. 8d. to her escheator William de Chiselden, 6s. 8d. to the clerk of Roger Beauchamp, one of the queen’s knights,39 3s. 4d. to Kersey’s clerk, 20s. 6d. to the jurors of the inquisition and others, and 40s. as gifts to various other officers of the queen. A total of at least £5 10s. 6d. was spent on this one enquiry.

The second was the wardship of the lands of Edmund Fitzherbert. Edmund’s father Reginald had died in 1346 when Edmund was aged eight or nine and the wardship had been granted to Richard Talbot.40 Edmund was to prove his age at Hereford on 11 May 1359,41 but on 20 January the king had ordered the escheator of Somerset and Dorset to inquire into the lands and heir of Reginald and who had been in possession since his death and had received the issues. The resulting inquisitions were held at Wells (Somerset) on 2 May and at Puddletown (Dorset) on 4 May. They found that Reginald had held in Dorset the manor of Broadmayne and a moiety of the manor of Mapperton, and in Somerset a moiety of Shepton Mallet and a quarter part of Midsomer Norton: Shepton Mallet had been assigned to Reginald’s widow Joan in dower and was then held by her and her second husband Thomas Blount, but custody of the rest had been granted to Talbot who had demised it to Berkeley who was then in possession.42 Walters’ account of 1358–9 mentions these two inquisitions.

36. BCM, A2/64/7–8.
37. BRO, AC/D/1/40, 41.
38. Cal. Pat. 1330–4, 55; M. Sharp (ed.), Accounts of the Constables of Bristol Castle in the Thirteenth and early Fourteenth Centuries (Bristol Rec. Soc. 34, 1982), liii, 60.
39. Roger Beauchamp (d. 1380) was a knight of Queen Philippa by Oct. 1340: Complete Peerage, II, 44–5.
40. Calendar of Inquisitions post Mortem [Cal. Inq. p.m.], VIII, 663; X, 474, 531.
41. Cal. Inq. p.m. X, 531.
42. Ibid. 474. Joan also held the manor of Hinton Martell and a moiety of Mappowder in jointure: Cal. Inq. p.m. VIII, 663.
He was away in Dorset for 12 days at the time of the Dorset inquisition, and payments were made of £2 15s. 4d. in gifts to the Dorset jurors and 13s. 4d. to the Wells jurors, while the escheator had 6s. 8d.43 A gift of 13s. 4d. to the sheriff of Somerset (at that time Sir John de St Lo) is also recorded, but it is not specified whether this was in connection with either the Gatcombe or the Fitzherbert affairs. The purpose of these inquisitions is not clear, but it may have been to establish who then held the custody of the lands as preparation for Edmund’s proof of age, after which he would be able to take possession himself. In these circumstances, the person who had the custody would be invited to the inquisition of proof so that he could dispute the findings if he wished. Sometimes they attended, but it was more frequently the case that, as with Berkeley at Hereford in May 1359, they did not attend, and this was duly recorded. The purpose of Berkeley’s payments, or bribes, to the jurors was presumably to ensure that they confirmed that his possession was legitimate.

It is perhaps not surprising to find evidence of bribery in connection with inquisitions on which much hung, such as the inquisition post mortem of Thomas IV Lord Berkeley in 1417.44 The business upon which John Walters was spending his lord’s money was of far less potential importance. They were simply ordinary, commonplace events in the history of any landed estate: the acquisition of a small holding, a wardship which had been purchased and an enquiry into customary dues. Moreover, the itemized payments sit side-by-side with such items as the purchase of parchment to record the court’s proceedings, payments to the reeve of Bedminster manor of £7 to repair a barn and 40s. to improve the oxen, and of £2 15s. spent on plastering and repairs to the house of the chantry chaplain attached to St Augustine’s abbey, Bristol. The accounts illustrate that such extensive bribery was so utterly routine as to be banal.

BRIDGET WELLS-FURBY
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Belinus Nansmoen and the foundation legend of Bristol

The personal name Belinus appears once in the Bristol wills documented in T.P. Wadley’s transcription and translation of Bristol’s The Great Orphan Book.45 The rarity of the name is attested by its absence from the York Poll Tax records, in which 30,000 individuals are recorded.46

43. Walters received 40s. from the reeve of Broadmayne during the year and the payment to the Dorset jurors was authorized by Roger de Manningford, the lord’s steward in Dorset, who received 20s. as his annual fee.

44. When Thomas died he left his nephew as heir male to the lordship of Berkeley and his daughter, the countess of Warwick, as heir to the rest, but determined to acquire as much as she could. The Beauchamps spent considerable sums on bribes to jurors, escheators, the under-sheriff of Gloucestershire and their clerks: BCM, GC4112; A Sinclair, ‘The Great Berkeley Law-Suit revisited 1417–39’, Southern Hist. 9 (1987), 36.

45. T.P. Wadley, Notes or Abstracts of the Wills Contained in the Volume entitled The Great Orphan Book and Book of Wills in the Council House at Bristol (Bristol, 1886), 96–7.

46. P.M. Stell, ‘Forenames in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Yorkshire: a study based on a biographical database generated by computer’, Medieval Prosopography 20 (1999), 95–128. The referee of this note further indicated that the name does not appear in any of the national Poll Tax records from 1377, 1379 or 1381, digitized for the ‘Family Names of the United Kingdom’ project at the University of the West of England, Bristol.
We can deduce something about the individual behind the name; legacies indicate that Belinus Nansmoen, the testator, was married, and that he probably fathered a child. Belinus Nansmoen was also the executor of one Alexander Bagenham, whose will was proved in February 1413. Belinus Nansmoen’s own will was written in 1416. Since he had a wife and child and had previously been an executor, it seems likely that he was at least 25 years old at death. This would give a birth date of, at latest, c.1390.

This is of interest: The Maire of Bristowe is Kalendar describes two Trojan princes named Belyne and his brother Brynne who travel around England, with Brynne ultimately founding Bristol. The Kalendar was begun in 1478/9 by Robert Ricart, Bristol’s town clerk. As a document it speaks to the prosperity and patriotism which led to Bristol’s charter over a century before. The name Belinus found here suggests that a Bristol-based individual was named for this local foundation legend, a particularly striking example of location-influenced naming which I have not found replicated elsewhere.

Ricart explains the key role in the foundation of modern England taken by Belyne: he ‘regnid nobly and in peace in this lande...’ and fought against his brother Brynne, who subsequently founded Bristol. The legend of Brennius and Belinus as Trojan brothers in England can be found much earlier, in Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Historia Regum Britanniae. In this history, written in the mid 12th century, the brothers are presented just as in Ricart’s Kalendar: they rule lands in the north of England and in France; come to blows from time to time; and are ultimately reunited by the intervention of their mother. The stories share details as well: in both Belinus is presented the eponymous founder of the Billingsgate. I suggest then that Ricart is broadly influenced by Geoffrey of Monmouth in his writing.

The Historia Regum Britanniae does not, however, describe Brennius as the founder of Bristol. Geoffrey of Monmouth had established the possibility of a Trojan prince as eponymous founder. By the time of Ricart’s Kalendar some 350 years later (and so between the mid 12th century and 1478) Brennius was introduced as part of a Bristolian founding legend.

Belinus Nansmoen’s will indicates that the story of the two brothers may have been important to the people of Bristol by 1370–90, a century earlier than the written evidence of Ricart’s Kalendar. This coincides with Bristol’s acquisition of county status, granted in a 1373 charter. The burgesses of Bristol petitioned for the charter, which extended the authority of the civic elite, and the stirred-up feelings of pride and patriotism could have led to the initiation of Bristol’s Great Orphan Book a few years later.

Belinus Nansmoen’s will therefore raises the hitherto unconsidered possibility that the founding legend of Brennius and Belinus was known in Bristol at the time and that the burgesses lobbied for Bristol as a special case with the king. The impact of the legend may have extended to influencing naming, as evidenced by Belinus’ parents’ choice of the name for their child. This name was highly unusual, being that of a Trojan prince rather than a more traditional Biblical figure. In an era when a third of the male population was called John, this was a significant move away from the norm.

49. Toulmin Smith, Kalendar, 3–9.
50. A. Thompson (ed.), Geoffrey of Monmouth: History of the Kings of Britain, with revisions by J.A. Giles (Ontario, 1999), 37 ff.
51. Ibid. 46; Toulmin Smith, Kalendar, 3–10.
52. Stell, ‘Forenames in Yorks.’, 123.
I have not been able to trace the surname Nansmoen (which Wadley records is spelt Nasmeon elsewhere)\(^53\) in any of the standard works on English surnames.\(^54\) Bardsley notes other surnames starting with Nant- or Nance- as being of Cornish origin, from the Celtic \(nant\)- meaning ‘valley’, which could suggest a Cornish origin for this surname.\(^55\) Inspection of the microfiche of Bristol's Great Orphan Book reveals that the final –n transcribed by Wadley could be an –r, giving Nansmoer. This would give a plausible, though as yet unattested, Cornish surname meaning ‘big valley’.\(^56\)

Various inferences can thus be drawn. The parents, or earlier male antecedents, may have been migrants to the city. Secondly, parents might, upon occasion, name their children for founding legends, although this has not been noted in earlier literature. Finally, the Brennius/Belinus founding legend was prevalent in the period 1370–90, a century earlier than previously attested, and at a time of change for the city.

RACHEL TOD
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Henbury Awdelett

*Henbury Awdelett* (sometimes *The Awdelett*) is the name of a prominent 17th-century house and formerly 1200-a. estate in Henbury. In recent years known also as Henbury Manor, it was described as such in 1598.\(^57\) The house and grounds have been owned by Bristol City Council since 1950 and currently serve as the premises of Woodstock School.\(^58\)

I have never seen the name *Awdelett* explained in print, but the material to explain it is available. It derives from the surname of John Audelett, who died in November 1536, the last steward of Abingdon abbey (Oxon.) before the Dissolution.\(^59\) John left an only daughter and heiress Elizabeth, who married Richard Beke and left a daughter and heiress Agnes Beke.\(^60\) She married a man surnamed Edmonds and left a son Edward Edmonds of Henbury, whose daughter and heiress

---


\(^{56}\) My thanks to the referee of this note for his helpful suggestion of the etymology.

\(^{57}\) In a fine: Sir J. Maclean, ‘Pedes finium or excerpts from the feet of fines, in the county of Gloucester, from the 30th Elizabeth to the 9th James I’, *Trans. BGAS* 17 (1892–3), 176.


\(^{59}\) *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of Henry VIII* [\(L&P\ \text{Hen. VIII}\)], XIII(1), no. 379 (February, not precisely dated) refers to the steward's accounts, rolls and books at ‘my aunt Awdelett's’. John was appointed steward by letters patent of 1508–9. For the accounts, see The National Archives [TNA], SP 5/4/18, ff. 18–26.

\(^{60}\) In 1598 (see f.n. 57) John's granddaughter Agnes, now widowed, brought suit against her parents of the 'manor of Henbury Awdelett alias Henbury Saltmarshe'. This was presumably done to safeguard her son Edward's inheritance. The wording is the earliest explicit reference to the current name of the estate that I have found. The relation between the Awdelett and the medieval manor of Henbury Saltmarsh has still to be elucidated.
Anne married William Diggs of Marlborough (Wils.) c.1610. She died on 31 January 1625/6,61 the estate was sold to Edward Sampson of Henbury in 1627.62

I have not discovered exactly how Audelett and his descendants came to acquire land in Henbury, nor (if any reason beyond tradition were needed) why the name continued to attach to the estate in the time of the Sampsons. As a lay officer, and royally-appointed surveyor of the lands of Abingdon abbey when it was being valued for disposal in 1535, John Audelett must have profited from the offices and may have used the proceeds to buy estates elsewhere. But he was already rich: he was a wool merchant (‘merchant of the staple’) and landowner in Berkshire,63 resident at Barton Court, Abingdon, and his trade connections may have guided him towards properties in the wool county of Gloucestershire.64 He was involved in much litigation in pursuit of debts in the mid 1530s, including those of John Vaughan, merchant of Bristol, which indicates a possible reason for his interest in the Bristol area.65 In 1535, he was working with Thomas Cromwell, Henry VIII’s minister, against certain interests of the abbot of Abingdon, and negotiating for the right to enjoy certain leases under the king’s pardon, and these negotiations appear to have been successful.66 Whether these leases included the Henbury property is not known.

Even without Burke’s assurance (f.n. 62), we can be confident that John, or his immediate family, is the source of the Henbury name. In the very large range of medieval and post-medieval records available to the ‘Family Names of the United Kingdom’ project based at the University of the West of England, Bristol (2010–16), no other instance of the surname has been found. It is French, rare though known from the north of the country, and probably derives from a diminutive form of a personal name of Germanic origin beginning with Ald- ‘old, venerable’.67 John almost certainly arrived in England through his involvement in the wool trade. The first person I have found with this name is recorded in 1508, when he bought manors in Oxfordshire and was evidently already rich.68 A person of the same name was in dispute with the Mayor of the Staple of Calais (at that time an English possession) over a cargo of wool in 1515–18.69 It is certain that these Johns are the same man, and the same man as the steward of Abingdon. The French connection is confirmed by the monumental brass of 1522 formerly in the church at Woburn (Beds.) with the inscription: ‘Pray for the soule of Margaret Awdelett daughter of John Awdelett, gentilman, and for the good astate of William Welbik, marchaunt of the staple of the towne of Caleyse, unto whom she shuld have been married [etc.]’.70

61. Her death is recorded in the registers of SS Peter and Paul, Marlborough, published in F. Madden et al., Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica 5 (London, 1838), 261.
62. J. Burke, A Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Commoners of Great Britain and Ireland, IV (London, 1838), 189, also giving the size of the estate, above.
64. His widow Katharine is mentioned in inquisitions post mortem as being of or connected with Gloucester: TNA, C 142/62/15.
65. TNA, CP 40/1038.
66. L&P Hen. VIII, VIII, no. 408, where the king’s award and confirmation of his stewardship (see f.n. 59 above) appears in draft.
68. TNA, CP 25/1/191/31, no. 66.
69. Ibid. C 1/378/11.
The wealthy Sampson family, who had lived in Henbury parish since at least the 16th century, bought the Audelett property in 1627 and continued to live there and be prominent in the village, with two heads of household serving as high sheriff of Gloucestershire in the 18th century. They maintained their leading position especially later through their marital connection with the Way family, until the last Sampson-Way died in 1947. Three successive Ways were vicars of Henbury from 1830 to 1927.

The present house is thought to date from c.1675 or a little later, presumably replacing an older house on or near the site. It was built on the profits of the Sampsons’ sugar plantation on the Caribbean island of Nevis, acquired in 1663. A plantation of John Sampson is mentioned in Nevis documents in 1678.

RICHARD COATES
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The inscription on the memorial to the Duke of Beaufort in Stoke Park

Norborne Berkeley, later Lord Botetourt, MP for Gloucestershire 1741–63, inherited the family estate at Stoke Gifford. Over some 20 years Berkeley laid out a landscaped park south of the house. The works in the park included the construction of several masonry features, one of

71. No connection has been established with Henry Sampson, dean of Westbury college 1459–69, which had strong interests in Henbury parish: indeed, Henbury Audelett was technically in Westbury parish (and mapped as such by the Ordnance Survey in the 1880s), presumably till the provisions of the Divided Parishes Act of 1882 were implemented, and was therefore presumably part of Westbury college’s medieval prebend of Henbury. For Henry’s career, N. Orme and J. Cannon, Westbury-on-Trym: Monastery, Minster and College. (Bristol Rec. Soc. 62, 2010), 80–1; and for the possible geographical basis of the prebend of Henbury, ibid. 37–9. As observed in f.n. 60, the territorial relation between the medieval manor of Saltmarsh and this prebend, abolished at the Dissolution, needs clarification. Orme and Cannon, 17–21, make a case for at least part of the Saltmarsh representing Westbury’s Godringhill prebend rather than Henbury.

72. Burke, Commoners, IV, 189.

73. Bristol Record Office [BRO], MS 24759/34, sale particulars, 9 Oct. 1947. It was eventually bought by the city council, as noted above.

74. BRO, MS P/Hen/X/16, list of vicars of Henbury, c.1940.


76. A. Sluyter, Black Ranching Frontiers: African cattle herders of the Atlantic world, 1500–1900 (New Haven, 2012), 128. Francis Sampson was in an influential position in the 1660s as Secretary of Nevis: Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, 1661–8, no. 1212.


which, in Barn Wood, was a sarcophagus-like monument erected some time after 1756 in memory of Berkeley's brother-in-law the 4th duke of Beaufort. It is built of limestone ashlar. A diagonally-buttressed base supports four vermiculated blocks, which carry a rectangular sarcophagus-like sculpture or construction. Below a frieze of irregular raised triglyphs there is an inscription. Mr Lambert and Mr Harding reported Bishop Pococke, visiting in 1764, as having recorded the words as FRATERNI DIGNUS AMORIS, worthy of a brother's love. Later authors repeated the transcription and the translation.

That they did so erroneously might be concluded for two reasons. First, in classical Latin the adjective dignus normally takes the dative, not the genitive. Educated at Westminster, where he will have been taught from Busby's grammar and versed in classical literature, Berkeley is not likely to have made an elementary mistake. Second, conventions of deference at that time would have made it presumptuous and impertinent for Berkeley, not then a peer, to have described his ducal brother-in-law as 'worthy' of anything Berkeley might have to offer him. Pococke's original handwritten text in fact records the inscription as FRATERNI PIGNUS AMORIS, a token of a brother's love, which is both grammatically correct and in context makes better sense.

The most recent restoration of the monument repeated in the carving the error in the transcription. The monument has been further damaged. When it is next restored, perhaps the correct wording could be carved. At the same time consideration might be given to the style of the lettering. That on the existing inscription is a mixture of classical and half-uncial letters with, for example, a rounded M, of the sort that became popular in Victorian times. Berkeley in the late 1750s is more likely to have commissioned lettering in strictly Trajanic style.

WILLIAM EVANS

An Indian mutiny memorial in Bristol cathedral

On the cloister wall of Bristol cathedral near the entrance to the coffee shop stands a marble memorial tablet commemorating 55 officers and men of the Second Battalion Military Train who lost their lives whilst serving as light cavalry during the Indian mutiny. The carving above the text depicts a sword and a musket resting upon a cushion; above the weapons is a helmet bearing the number two. The tablet is fixed to a black base on which the following words appear: INDIA – LUCKNOW – AZIMGHAR – ALUMBAGH – JUGDESPORE.

Each time I passed it I used to wonder how the railway became involved in the campaign, but research showed that the regiment's title predated the age of steam locomotives. By the end of the 18th century it was necessary to establish an organization charged with the responsibility of transporting the army and its equipment, and the Royal Waggoners was formed in 1792; it was renamed as the Royal Wagon Train a few years later. However, by 1833: ‘all vestiges of a permanent organization – the Royal Wagon Train organized by the Duke of Wellington in the


Peninsular War – had been swept away [by Treasury cuts]. During the course of the Crimean War it became apparent that the regiment had to be resurrected and in 1855 the Land Transport Corps was formed; it was renamed the Military Train in the following year. Horfield barracks, completed in 1847, was designated as the depot for the new corps.

In April 1857 the Second Battalion of the Military Train embarked on the freight ship Blanvic Castle bound for Hong Kong. However, soon after the vessel’s departure, news of the start of the Indian Mutiny reached those in authority and, in the words of a letter to The Times:

The second battalion of the Military Train … was … sent out with the Chinese expedition as a portion of the force to be employed in guarding and conducting the stores, baggage and transport of the army. The battalion was luckily intercepted, and on its landing at Calcutta it was immediately turned into light cavalry, and was marched off at once … I have not the least doubt but that they will do excellent service. The battalion numbered 259 horsemen, and would make a very strong squadron … The men are young, active and well drilled, their average height 5ft 6 in., and, as they were well armed and equipped, there would be no expense in turning them into cavalry. Their services would be invaluable in scouring the country, in breaking up parties of mutineers or bands of dacoits, who will hover around us long after the masses of the enemy have been shivered into pieces.

The battalion arrived in Calcutta in June and took part in the relief of Lucknow during the course of which they were with the force that recaptured the Alambagh, a walled enclosure some five miles from Lucknow, and they remained there for some months when the mutineers counter-attacked. Eventually the tide turned and the battalion took part in the relief of Azimgarh and returned home in the autumn of 1859.

Two members of the Military Train received the Victoria Cross for their actions during the campaign:

The Queen has been graciously pleased to signify her intention to confer the decoration of the Victoria Cross on the undermentioned soldier of Her Majesty's Army, whose claim to the same has been submitted for Her Majesty's approval on account of an act of bravery performed by him in India as recorded against his name viz: Private Samuel Morley No 201 2nd Battalion Military Train. On the evacuation of Azimgurh by Koer Singh's army on the 15th April 1858 a squadron of the Military Train and half a troop of Horse Artillery were sent in pursuit. Upon overtaking them and coming into action with their rearguard, a squadron of the 3rd Sikh Cavalry (also detached in pursuit) and one troop of the Military Train were ordered to charge when Lieutenant Hamilton, who commanded the Sikhs, was unhorsed and immediately surrounded by the enemy who commenced cutting and hacking him while on the ground. Private Samuel Morley, seeing the predicament that Lieutenant Hamilton was in, although his (Morley’s) horse had been shot from under him, immediately and most gallantly

82. Bristol Mercury, 3 Nov. 1855.
83. The Times 29 Apr. 1857.
84. Ibid. 30 Oct. 1857.
85. Ibid. 4 May 1858.
86. Ibid. 10 Oct. 1859.
rushed upon foot to his assistance, and in conjunction with Farrier Murphy [also of the Military Train], who has already received the Victoria Cross for the same thing, cut down one of the sepoys and fought over Lieutenant Hamilton’s body until further assistance came up and thereby was the means of saving Lieutenant Hamilton from being killed on the spot.88

Queen Victoria presented the medal to Private Morley at Windsor castle on 8 November 1860.

So much for the Note. The Query relates to the circumstances in which the memorial appeared in Bristol cathedral. The Second Battalion had been based at Horfield barracks before it left for the Far East, but on its return in October 1859 it was quartered at Aldershot. On 20 April 1859 The Times had reported: ‘orders have been received for the breaking up of the Military Train depot at Horfield barracks. The men will join the 2nd battalion on its return from India’.

Members of the regiment must have started the subscription for the memorial before their colleagues had returned, because on 3 September 1859 The Builder recorded:

Two mural monuments are about being forwarded from Mr Richardson’s studio for erection in Bristol and Winchester cathedrals, one for the former to the deceased officers and men of the 2nd battalion Military Train, which served so efficiently as light cavalry in the late Indian rebellion. It is of large size, in white marble, the regimental details are in bold relief above the inscription, which contains the names of the deceased; and the whole is mounted on a polished slab of black marble, relieved at the four angles with enamelled brasses of the actions in red, blue and white – India, Lucknow, Alumbagh, Azinghar and Judespore.89

On 12 November 1859 the Western Daily Press reported:

A memorial of large dimensions and chaste design has just been placed in our cathedral to the memory of those officers and men of the 2nd battalion Military Train who fell while serving as light cavalry during the late rebellion in India. It is of white marble, well relieved by enamelled brasses, on a black marble ground. It is the work of Mr Richardson, the eminent military and medical90 sculptor of London – Melbury House, Dorset Square, N.W. The site was liberally granted by the Dean and Chapter, and the memorial is erected by the comrades of the deceased warriors of all ranks serving in the Military Train.

The Western Daily Press report seems to suggest that the memorial was unceremoniously attached to the fabric of the cathedral, but it is difficult to accept that this was the case. Although there was no Military Train presence in Bristol after the conclusion of the campaign, members must have been in touch with the cathedral chapter about the memorial; it was, after all, ‘erected by their comrades of all ranks’. Similarly, representatives would surely have been present at any service of dedication, but no record of any correspondence, faculty or special service has been found in the cathedral’s records. The National Archives contains a number of items relating to the Military Train, but none of them appear to relate to the memorial. It might be expected that any special ceremony or parade would be reported in the local press, but no such report appears. Until further evidence (if it exists) is found, the report in the Western Daily Press remains the only account of the manner in which this Indian mutiny memorial came to be in Bristol cathedral.

W. JOHN LYES

88. The Times, 8 Aug. 1860.
89. The Builder 17 (1859), 590.
90. ‘Medical’ must be a misprint. Edward Richardson was a noted restorer of medieval sculptures.
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A Gloucestershire and Bristol Atlas

Last year an exercise book came to light in Cheltenham College. It has hard covers and measures 7” × 9”. On a label on the top right hand corner of the outer front cover can just be read ‘BGAS atlas’. It was donated by the College to the Society and has been added to the Society’s archives, as Gloucestershire Archives accession number 13830.

This volume seems to have belonged to W.L. King, a master at the College from 1920. It contains his notes of images suggested for the Atlas, which was published by the Society in 1961. The Atlas itself does not name its editors, but their identities are revealed in the Report of Council for 1961. It was compiled by a small committee, enthusiastically led by King, and was seen through the press by the Society’s Editor, Captain Gracie.

As the introduction to the Atlas states, a proposal to publish a facsimile of Taylor’s one inch map of Gloucestershire had been mooted several years before, but had been put aside due to the lack of a good original from which to print. This problem was resolved when an excellent copy of the map, formerly owned by Sir Thomas Phillipps, came to light. The Society then decided to expand the project to include other county maps, as well as those for some of the principal towns such as Bristol, Gloucester, Tewkesbury and Stroud.

The volume contains short notes of proposed contents for the Atlas and is also of interest because it gives the location of some of the originals from which the images were taken. Many of its suggestions were not adopted, perhaps because of financial constraints. For example, several of Ogilby’s ribbon maps of main roads were suggested, but only one appears in the published volume.

This little book is a useful addition to the archives of the Society and thanks are due to Cheltenham College for their gift.

DAVID SMITH
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Tribulations of a Meetings Secretary

Following my note on ‘Tales from Past Meetings of the Society’, the late Mrs Mary Campbell (see Obituaries) sent me reminiscences of her experiences as Meetings Secretary 1980–95 and previously assisting Dr Basil Cottle. During her tenure she organized 73 field meetings and many overseas meetings. I attended these meetings fairly regularly and one was never aware of the problems and crises that she had to handle. First were difficult coach drivers for an archaeological excursion – something different from standard driving along motorways to a coach park. They disliked B roads, thought they knew the best route and did not (and would not) accept guidance. Usually, she managed to find a driver who was cooperative and insist upon him being used. More difficult were members who strayed or got lost (and the time taken to find them, upsetting the

programme), or who got left behind or mistook the place where the coach was to pick them up. There were two members (and occasionally others one knew) who would always be late, and I think she may have factored this into the timetable.

One specific and very trying event happened on a visit to Foscombe House at Ashleworth. Our host suggested we leave by a different drive from that by which we had arrived. It ended at a cattle grid, which buckled as the coach crossed it and got stuck. Somewhat over 50 members then had to be transported by relays of car followers to the tea place about three miles away. Eventually the coach was extricated, but had to reverse back down a long drive before it could turn to collect members after their tea.

Such are the worries and tribulations of a Meetings Secretary, of which we knew nothing and never heard about. They indicate the resilience and patience that is needed. It is not a task for the faint hearted.

†GERARD LEIGHTON